

# Indiana Academic Standards Evaluation Status Update

*March 24, 2014*

*Evaluation Team Leaders:*

*Molly Chamberlin, Ph.D., CECI*

*Danielle Shockey, IDOE*



**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**



# Today's Update

- HEA 1427 Requirements
- Project Plan Overview and Status Update
- FAQ on Comments Received To Date
- Questions

# HEA 1427 Requires SBOE To Adopt “College and Career Readiness Standards”

- State Board of Education required to perform a “comprehensive evaluation of the common core standards”
- State Board of Education required to “adopt college and career readiness educational standards” by July 1, 2014.
- “The educational standards must meet national and international benchmarks for college and career readiness standards and be aligned with postsecondary educational expectations. The state board shall implement educational standards that use the common core standards as the base model for academic standards to the extent necessary to comply with federal standards to receive a flexibility waiver under 20 U.S.C. 7861.”

# **Legislative Study Committee, OMB Fiscal Impact Report, Impact Upon Schools Provided Additional Parameters**

- 6 members of the 12 member Legislative Study Committee issued the following guidance in November 2013:
  - Utilize the highest standards in the United States
  - Prepare Hoosier students for college and career success
  - Obtain a waiver from No Child Left Behind
  - Maintain Indiana's sovereignty and independence from the federal government
  - Effective testing to match our rigorous standards.
- OMB Fiscal Impact report, submitted by September 1, 2013, concluded the cost to Indiana would increase if adoption of standards and selection of an assessment were delayed and urged standards adoption well before the July 1 deadline.
- Other factors: balanced calendar/early August start dates; teachers need sufficient time to consider transitions in curriculum maps and develop new lessons plans

# Today's Update

- HEA 1427 Requirements
- Project Plan Overview and Status Update
- FAQ on Comments Received To Date
- Questions

# Evaluation Project Plan Overview: 2014

Task	3 - 9 Feb	10 - 16 Feb	17 - 23 Feb	24 Feb - 2 Mar	3 - 9 Mar	10 - 16 Mar	17 - 23 Mar	24 - 30 Mar	31 Mar - 6 Apr	7 - 13 Apr	14 - 20 Apr	21 - 27 Apr	28 Apr - 2 May
			DRAFT #1			DRAFT #2		DRAFT #3			DRAFT #4	DRAFT #5	
Orientation & Training	3 FEB												
EVAL. PAN.: Individual eval.	4 - 11 FEB												
EVAL. PAN.: On-site Reconcil.		13 - 14 FEB											
Public eReview of Draft			19 FEB - 12 MAR										
Public Hearings				24 - 26 FEB									
National Expert Reviews			20 - 28 FEB			14 - 24 MAR							
Articulation					3 MAR - 13 APR								
EVAL. PAN.: Individual Review						14 - 18 MAR							
EVAL. PAN.: On-site Reconcil.							19 - 20 MAR						
CCR PAN.: Individual Review								24 - 27 MAR					
CCR PAN.: On-site Reconcil.								28 MAR					
Architecture							21 MAR - 7 APR						
Finalize Draft								29 MAR - 7 APR					
CCR PAN.: Final Review									8-11 APR				
FINAL DRAFT POSTED ONLINE											14 APR		
Ed Roundtable Review/Update			20 FEB									21 APR	
SBOE Meeting	6 FEB					12 MAR				9 APR			28 APR

# Panel Member, Content Specialist Qualifications

## **Evaluation Panel Members: Sample Qualifications**

- Doctorate in Educational Administration & Supervision; Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, former teacher (Carmel-Clay Schools, “A” rated last 4 years)
- Ph.D., Rhetoric and Composition; Assistant Professor of English (Ball State University)
- Ph.D., Language Education; Assoc. Prof. of English Education (Purdue University)
- Ph.D., Mathematics Education; Prof. of Mathematical Sciences (Purdue University)
- Principals, Teachers, Math Coaches, Literacy Coaches

## **IDOE Content Specialists: Sample Qualifications**

- Doctorate in Executive Educational Leadership and Curriculum; Master's in Curriculum and Instruction; Bachelor's in Mathematics and Computer Programming
- Former Mathematics Department Chair
- Decades of teaching experience
- K-12 Gifted and Talented Endorsement
- 10 years of experience as a literacy subject matter expert

# Phase I: Evaluation – Completed February 19

- Consulting, facilitation and orientation: Sujie Shin, Assistant Director of the [Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation](#) at WestEd
- Math and English/Language Arts Evaluation Panel evaluations
  - Evaluated multiple sets of standards on their own merit
    - Math: IAS 2000, IAS 2009, CCSS, NCTM
    - E/LA: IAS 2006, CCSS, NCTE.
  - Panels divided into groups of four: Math (K-5, 6-12) and ELA (K-5, 6-12)
  - On-site “blind” consensus evaluation process Feb. 13-14
  - Other standards used during on-site evaluation: Massachusetts (*Dr. Sandra Stotsky*)
  - Each team either: (1) selected one of the existing written standards, (2) combined language from two or more versions to achieve maximum clarity, or (3) wrote their own standard.

## Evaluation Team Process

### Mathematics/2<sup>nd</sup> Grade/Computation

Math	2	Model addition of numbers less than 100 with objects and pictures	"0"		
Math	2	Add two whole numbers less than 100 with and without regrouping	"+"		
Math	2	Subtract two whole numbers less than 100 without regrouping	"+"		
Math	2	Understand and use the inverse relationship between addition and subtraction	"+"	"understand" is unclear in this context;	
Math	2	Use estimation to decide whether answers are reasonable in addition problems	"+"		This should be a practice that is always followed.
Math	2	Use mental arithmetic to add or subtract 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 10 with numbers less than 100	"+"		Mental strategies are important, but none are being taught!
Math	2	Solve problems involving addition and subtraction of whole numbers less than 1,000 fluently using a standard algorithmic approach and show the inverse relationship between addition and subtraction	"0"	still need to emphasize meaning beyond algorithm	
Math	2	Fluently add and subtract within 100 using strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction	"+"	define fluently; define "within 100"	What does "fluently" mean at this level?

# Phase I: Public Comment Period – Completed March 12

- Draft standards posted 2/19 – “DRAFT #1”
  - “Raw ingredients” - no articulation or architecture yet conducted; math standards not placed in courses.
- Public hearings in Sellersburg, Indianapolis, Plymouth 2/24-2/26
- Approximately 100 individuals in total testified
- 10 of 11 Board members attended at least one hearing
- Content specialists, evaluation panel members, SBOE and IDOE staff also attended all three hearings
- Invitations sent to the following local and national experts to provide input on 2/19 version of draft standards (DRAFT #1):
  - Dr. Sandra Stotsky (University of Arkansas) – declined to review
  - Dr. James Milgram (Stanford University) – conducted preliminary review and provided input to team
  - Dr. James Davis (IU Bloomington) – declined to review
  - Dr. Shauna Findlay (Indiana ASCD) – completed review
  - Ms. Janet Rummel (Indiana Network of Independent Schools) – completed review
  - Ms. Kathleen Porter-Magee (Fordham Institute) – completed review
- Over 2,000 comments submitted through online portal (closed on 11:59 PM on March 12<sup>th</sup>)



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Glenda Ritz, Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Imagining the possibilities.  
Making them happen.

[HOME](#) [PARENTS & STUDENTS](#) [ADMINISTRATORS](#) [EDUCATORS](#) [COMMUNITY](#) [DATA](#)

Site  
Map

Search



[Indiana Academic Standards Review 2014 Evaluation Process.](#)



## Achievement

[Assessment](#)  
[Career Education](#)  
[Curriculum](#)  
[eLearning](#)  
[English Learners](#)  
[Special Education](#)  
[Standards](#)

[Home](#) > [Achievement](#) > [Standards](#) > Public Comment on Identified K-12 Content Standards for College and Career Readiness

# Public Comment on Identified K-12 Content Standards for College and Career Readiness

Posted: Tue, 02/18/2014 - 8:35am

Updated: Wed, 02/19/2014 - 6:52pm

## Mathematics and English/Language Arts

### Proposed College and Career Ready Standards

#### Mathematics

- [k-5-math-excel](#)
- [k-5-math-pdf](#)
- 
- [6-8-math-excel](#)

Content area \*

Please Select

Grade level \*

Please Select

Standard number \*

0

Select one (see survey instructions for definition of terms below) \*

- ☐ Bias
- ☐ Free of Bias
- ☐ Clarity
- ☐ Lack of Clarity
- ☐ Specificity
- ☐ Lack of Specificity
- ☐ Grade Appropriate
- ☐ Grade Inappropriate
- ☐ Other

Comment on the specific standard

Once you click "Submit Your Comments", your information will be saved. You will have the opportunity on the "Thank You" page to return to this form and make additional comments.

Submit Your Comments

Back

## **Phase II: Articulation – In Process Through March 20**

### Evaluation Team Leaders and IDOE Content Specialists: Through March 15

- Articulation Step 1:
  - Appropriate balance for depths of knowledge (DOK) represented: Recall, Skill/Concept, Strategic Thinking, Extended Thinking
  - Balance for Skill Acquisition: Introductory Skill, Practice Skill, Mastery of Skill
  - Alignment in both DOK and Skill Acquisition to grade levels above and below
- Articulation Step 2: Remove any redundancy and make edits for like skills that can be integrated into one standard
- Articulation Step 3: Incorporation of any outstanding public comments and recommendation from technical and advisory teams into Draft #2

### Evaluation Panels: March 19-20

- Articulation Step 4: Reconvene evaluation panels in person Mar. 19-20 for K-12 articulation

## **Phase II: National Expert Input – In Process Through March 24**

- The following national experts have entered into contracts with the state to provide input on DRAFT #2 of the standards:
  - Dr. Terrence Moore (Hillsdale College) – E/LA
  - Joanne Eresh (Achieve) – E/LA
  - Dr. James Milgram (Stanford University) – Math
  - Professor Hung-Hsi Wu (UC Berkeley) – Math
  - Kaye Forgione (Achieve) – Math
- Experts are providing input at the standards level, and also with respect to grade level and content strand articulation
- Due to the large volume of public comments submitted online, as well as the assistance from national experts, the timeline was shifted out by three weeks to provide sufficient time for the evaluation team leaders and the CCR Panel to carefully consider all input.

## **Phase III: Architecture – In Process Through April 7**

### Architecture

1. Identify and articulate guiding principles
2. Identify layout of document and components to include, e.g., goals of standards, overview of organization of standards, glossary, companion documents including examples
3. Identify whether/how anchor and process standards are incorporated, as well as literacy standards

# **Phase III: College and Career Ready Panel – In Process Through April 11**

## College and Career Ready Panel (CCR Panel)

- Invited to observe evaluation panels conduct K-12 articulation on Mar. 19-20
- Will receive DRAFT #3, reflecting the work of the evaluation panels as well as the input from national experts, for onsite review on March 28
- CCR Panel meets March 28 from 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM to review DRAFT #3

## Evaluation Team Leaders and IDOE Content Specialists

- Incorporate input from CCR Panel, finalize input from national experts: March 31-early April

## College and Career Ready Panel (CCR Panel)

- CCR Panel meets again to finalize recommendations – Date TBD
- DRAFT #4 posted online – target date of April 14

# Final Approval Steps

## STATE

- Legislative Services Agency preparing fiscal impact report required by statute
- Education Roundtable meets April 21
  - Any changes to DRAFT #4 by the Roundtable will result in creation of DRAFT #5
- State Board of Education meets April 28
  - Public comments accepted during meeting

## FEDERAL

- USDOE to approve of process by which standards deemed “CCR”

# Today's Update

- HEA 1427 Requirements
- Project Plan Overview and Status Update
- FAQ on Comments Received To Date
- Questions

# Evaluation Team Qualifications and Perceived Bias

Comment	Analysis
Evaluation panel members unqualified	Evaluation teams were made up of classroom teachers, curriculum coaches, administrators, and school district staff with over 447 years of combined experience in English/Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as subject matter experts with earned doctorates in Mathematics, Mathematics Education, Rhetoric and Composition, Language Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Elementary Education, representing various Indiana institutions of higher education.
Evaluation panel members biased toward Common Core	<p>While several members of the evaluation team may have worked on PARCC teams, or may have testified against the Common Core pause, that does not make them biased toward the Common Core. Many educators were against the Common Core pause, due to real and perceived disruptions in education. Those who served on PARCC teams were selected not because of any Common Core bias, but because of their subject matter expertise, content knowledge, and expert reputations—the same reasons they were selected to serve on College and Career Ready or Advisory panels.</p> <p>The evaluation panel teams were selected from previously-identified technical, advisory, and CCR teams. Those teams were created using a variety of methods, including working to ensure that all types of school districts were represented; reaching out to other state agencies and entities for recommendations; and identifying subject matter experts.</p>

# Content Specialist Qualifications, National Expert Role

Comment	Analysis
Content Specialists Unqualified	Content specialists are IDOE employees who have been hired on the basis of their content knowledge, demonstrated expertise with standards, and teaching experience. It is the job of these individuals, under the direction of the Evaluation Team Leaders (Dr. Molly Chamberlin, Danielle Shockey, Dr. Michele Walker, Amy Horton), to conduct the daily work required during the standards evaluation process. There are 8 content specialists working on the Math and E/LA standards: four Math and four E/LA content specialists.
National Experts Biased Towards Common Core	<p>Sujie Shin, Senior Research Associate and Assistant Director of the Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation for WestEd, was hired to assist the Evaluation Team Leaders in designing a comprehensive standards evaluation process. Ms. Shin provided training to the evaluation panel members on how to evaluate a standard and determine whether it is clear, bias-free, and at the appropriate level of rigor. Ms. Shin did not conduct an evaluation of the standards.</p> <p>By design, national experts representing a balance of perspectives were invited to serve as independent evaluators of Drafts #1 and #2 of the standards.</p> <p>Drafts # 3 and #4 will be prepared by the Evaluation Team Leaders following meetings with the CCR panel on March 28 and in early April. It is the job of the CCR Panel to determine the final set of standards that is presented to the Education Roundtable.</p>

## Speed of Process, Lack of Coherence in 2/19 Draft

Comment	Analysis
Process too rushed	<p>The process of standards review of evaluation began in October, when IDOE organized technical teams (to review the current academic standards and Indiana “danglers”), as well as the Advisory and College and Career Readiness teams, to review the work of the technical team. Following the State Board resolution of December 20<sup>th</sup>, evaluation panels were created using the pre-existing teams, and the work to evaluate multiple sets of standards began right away.</p> <p>The state must have a sense of urgency to release the new College and Career Ready standards to schools before the summer begins, so that schools may begin planning for transition to implementation in 2014-2015, and the state may begin plans to adopt its college and career ready assessment in 2015-2016 (with piloting in 2014-2015 by continued use of CoreLink).</p>
Draft standards posted 2/19 not articulated, lacking architecture	<p>This was done by design, in order to maximize transparency and public input into the standards process. Indiana is one of the first early adopter Common Core states that is attempting to substantially revise its standards. The teams felt it important that the public be permitted to weigh in on the “raw ingredients” of the standards—the skills identified by the experts as skills necessary to ensure that students are college and career ready.</p> <p>Each subsequent draft will reflect public comments as well as input from national evaluators.</p>

# Educator Concerns About Impact on Students, Schools

Comment	Analysis
<p>Teachers frustrated and concerned about changing standards, impact upon student outcomes, schools</p>	<p>IDOE and the State Board will work diligently to provide transition support that will minimize the impact of the change in standards (much like is done every time standards change).</p> <p>The professional development will include crosswalks from previous standards to new standards; guidance documents; and other materials to help teachers transition to the new standards.</p>

# Today's Update

- HEA 1427 Requirements
- Project Plan Overview and Status Update
- FAQ on Comments Received To Date
- Questions